

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Before Commissioners: Joseph T. Kelliher, Chairman;  
Sudeen G. Kelly, Marc Spitzer,  
Philip D. Moeller, and Jon Wellinghoff.

Gulf South Pipeline Company, LP

Docket No. RP07-179-000

ORDER ACCEPTING TARIFF SHEETS, SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS

(Issued March 30, 2007)

1. On February 20, 2007, Gulf South Pipeline Company, LP (Gulf South) filed tariff sheets, listed in the appendix, to (1) include *pro forma* negotiated rate letter agreements for its no-notice service (NNS) and firm transportation service (FTS) in its FERC Gas Tariff, (2) offer evergreen provisions in certain NNS and FTS service agreements, and (3) clarify its ability to offer a contractual right of first refusal (ROFR) to NNS and FTS customers not eligible for the regulatory ROFR. Gulf South requests the proposed tariff sheets become effective April 1, 2007. For the reasons set forth below, the Commission accepts the referenced tariff sheets to become effective April 1, 2007, subject to Gulf South filing revised tariff sheets reflecting modifications to its proposed *pro forma* negotiated rate letter agreements as discussed below, within 20 days of the date of issuance of this order.

**Description of the Filing**

2. Gulf South states that its proposed NNS and FTS *pro forma* negotiated rate letter agreements are similar to its existing *pro forma* discounted rate letter agreements. The *pro forma* negotiated rate letter agreements are intended to establish a framework for all the negotiated rate agreements executed by Gulf South and ensure that the agreements do not contain material deviations from Gulf South's tariff.

3. Gulf South proposes to include in the *pro forma* NNS and FTS negotiated rate agreements optional language providing that, in exchange for entering into a negotiated rate, a customer may agree to waive or limit its right to file, initiate, or support certain actions filed pursuant to section 5 of the Natural Gas Act (NGA). The optional section 5 provision is set forth in brackets and would read as follows:

In consideration of the negotiated rate described above, during the term of this Agreement, [Company Name] will not file, initiate, or support any action filed pursuant to Section 5 of the Natural Gas Act against Gulf South that would have the effect of reducing Gulf South's maximum Tariff rate or fuel charge established in this Agreement.

4. Gulf South states that placing the section 5 waiver provision in the form of negotiated rate letter agreements responds to the Commission's prior finding that this language currently constitutes a material deviation and must be filed as a non-conforming contract.<sup>1</sup> Gulf South asserts that adding this language to such agreements will ensure that the language is contained in Gulf South's tariff and will not constitute a non-conforming provision. Gulf South states that it is not proposing to add this language to its *pro forma* discounted rate agreement or its *pro forma* service agreements.

5. In addition, Gulf South is proposing to add language to clarify its ability to grant a contractual right of first refusal (ROFR) pursuant to section 30.2 of the General Terms and Conditions (GT&C) of its tariff. Currently, under section 30.2, a customer may negotiate a contractual ROFR. However, Gulf South's tariff currently contains an optional provision for contractual ROFRs in its NNS and FTS discounted rate letter agreement forms, but the FTS and NNS rate schedules and service agreements do not contain corresponding language.

6. Finally, Gulf South is proposing a new option in its tariff to allow Gulf South and its customers to agree to include an evergreen right provision in an NNS and FTS discounted rate or negotiated rate letter agreement. Gulf South states that the evergreen provision would be available on a not unduly discriminatory basis only to customers that do not qualify for the regulatory ROFR provided by section 30 of its GT&C to maximum rate shippers with contracts for a year or more. The evergreen provision would provide the customer the right to extend its service agreement at the end of its initial term at an established rate or a rate to be mutually agreed upon. The evergreen right could be exercised only once, and the new evergreen contract could not exceed the length of the original contract term or increase the original contract's contract demand. Gulf South asserts that it is adding the evergreen option to its tariff in response to the market's request for increased rate certainty.

### **Notice, Interventions, and Protests**

7. Public notice of Gulf South's filing was issued on February 23, 2007, with interventions and protests due as provided in section 154.210 of the Commission's

---

<sup>1</sup> *Gulf South Pipeline Co.*, 115 FERC ¶ 61,123, at P 5 (2006) (*Gulf South*).

regulations, 18 C.F.R. § 154.210 (2006). Pursuant to Rule 214, 18 C.F.R. § 385.214 (2006), all timely filed motions to intervene and any motions to intervene out-of-time filed before the date of issuance of this order are granted. Granting late intervention at this stage of the proceeding will not disrupt the proceeding or place additional burdens on existing parties. On March 5, 2007, BP America Production Company, BP Energy Company, Chevron U.S.A. Inc., ConocoPhillips Company, and Shell Offshore Inc. (collectively referred to as Indicated Shippers) filed a protest. On March 12, 2007, Merrill Lynch Commodities, Inc. (Merrill Lynch) filed a motion for leave to intervene and comments out-of-time. On March 20, 2007, after submitting a timely intervention, CenterPoint Energy Entex and Atmos Energy Corporation (collectively referred to Entex and Atmos) filed a joint comment. The Commission will consider the comments in its analysis of the instant filing. On March 13, 2007, Gulf South filed an answer to the protest. On March 21, 2007, Indicated Shippers filed an answer to Gulf South's answer. On March 23, 2007, Merrill Lynch filed an answer to Gulf South's answer. Generally, the Commission does not permit answers to protests and answers to answers, however, the Commission will accept Gulf South's, Indicated Shippers', and Merrill Lynch's answers as they aid in the Commission's review of the instant proposal.<sup>2</sup>

### **Discussion**

8. For the reasons discussed below, the Commission accepts Gulf South's filing, subject to the condition that Gulf South modify or remove the section 5 waiver provision from its *pro forma* negotiated rate letter agreement and make certain other changes in that letter agreement.

### **Section 5 Waiver**

#### **Comments**

9. Indicated Shippers request that the Commission reject Gulf South's proposal to include an "optional" section 5 waiver in its *pro forma* NNS and FTS negotiated rate letter agreements as unjust, unreasonably creating a risk of undue discrimination, and inconsistent with Commission precedent. Indicated Shippers argue that Gulf South does not propose to limit the section 5 waiver provision to specific negotiated rate transactions, as required by Commission policy, or to specific negotiated rate agreements as non-conforming service agreements subject to Commission approval, but instead has proposed to include an optional section 5 waiver provision in its *pro forma* negotiated rate agreements. Indicated Shippers assert that allowing Gulf South, with its market power, to include such overly broad and potentially discriminatory language in its *pro forma* agreements would likely result in most, if not all, new negotiated agreements

---

<sup>2</sup> 18 C.F.R. § 385.213(a)(2) (2006).

including a section 5 waiver provision, particularly agreements with larger shippers with resources to litigate.

10. Indicated Shippers argue that Gulf South's proposed section 5 waiver provision would prohibit a negotiated rate shipper from participating in any section 5 fuel proceedings because there is one system-wide fuel rate on Gulf South. Thus, Indicated Shippers argue, even if a shipper has a negotiated rate FTS agreement subject to the applicable tariff fuel rate, because the shipper has a negotiated FTS contract, the shipper could not participate in a section 5 fuel proceeding. Indicated Shippers also argue that many shippers have multiple service agreements under the same rate schedule, and a shipper with a negotiated rate agreement would be prohibited from exercising its section 5 rights even if the shipper has a maximum recourse rate or discounted rate agreement under the same rate schedule or enters into such an agreement in the future. Additionally, Indicated Shippers state that Gulf South's maximum recourse rates may apply to a negotiated rate shipper's authorized overruns or nominations from supplemental points under existing contracts.

11. Finally, Indicated Shippers assert that although the Commission has previously accepted specific Gulf South negotiated rate NNS agreements, under which NNS shippers have agreed to waive their section 5 rights in exchange for a revenue sharing mechanism, that precedent does not govern this case because the circumstances are very different. Indicated Shippers argue that in that proceeding, Gulf South agreed to adjust the shippers' negotiated NNS rates if Gulf South earned a certain overall corporate return during the previous year. Indicated Shippers emphasize that because the rate adjustment was to be based on Gulf South's return, the Commission found that the negotiated rate agreements' adjustment provision would be affected by a section 5 action.<sup>3</sup>

### Answers

12. In its answer, Gulf South states that its proposed section 5 waiver provision is entirely consistent with Commission policy and precedent.<sup>4</sup> Furthermore, Gulf South

---

<sup>3</sup> *Gulf South*, 115 FERC ¶ 61,123 at P 6.

<sup>4</sup> Gulf South argues that the Commission rejected the waiver provision in *Maritimes & Northeast Pipeline, L.L.C.*, 118 FERC ¶ 61, 110 (2007), because it required that the shipper support or not oppose the pipeline's positions regarding any cost of service, cost allocation or rate design issue in any and all NGA section 4 proceedings filed by the pipeline through the term of the agreement. It further argues that the Commission rejected the waiver language in *Columbia Gas Transmission Corp.*, 111 FERC ¶ 61,338 (2005) (*Columbia*), because it required the shipper to waive its section 5 rights to file a complaint challenging the base rate or the rate structure of either Columbia Gas or its affiliate Columbia Gulf.

reiterates that the language is identical to language contained in negotiated rate letter agreements Gulf South previously submitted to the Commission which were approved as properly limited in scope to the maximum rate for service the customer is receiving, and not presenting a significant risk for discrimination.<sup>5</sup> Gulf South asserts that its proposed section 5 waiver provision is restricted only to a shipper's right to seek a reduction in the maximum rate applicable to the rate schedule under which the shipper has contracted for transportation service and does not apply to the shipper exercising its section 5 rights regarding other services or tariff provisions. Therefore, Gulf South asserts that Indicated Shippers' contention that Gulf South's proposed section 5 provision is overly broad or inconsistent with Commission precedent must be rejected. Gulf South adds that the proposed waiver is optional, since under its tariff all customers have multiple transportation and service options.

13. In its response, Indicated Shippers propose that to the extent Gulf South's *pro forma* negotiated rate agreements include a section 5 waiver, the provision should state that:

No action taken by shipper in any Section 5 proceeding shall [a]ffect the specific rate(s) agreed to under this Agreement.

14. Indicated Shippers state that including the above section 5 waiver provision in Gulf South's *pro forma* negotiated rate letter agreements would allow shippers to participate in a section 5 proceeding regarding the fuel rate. In addition, Indicated Shippers contend that the above language would allow a FTS shipper to participate in section 5 proceedings that relate to a maximum FTS tariff rate or discounted FTS rate that the shipper may be paying under other non-negotiated rate FTS service agreements. Indicated Shippers state that such a limited waiver provision would result in long-term rate certainty and assurance that Gulf South and the negotiated rate shipper will both realize the benefits of the agreement.

### **Commission Ruling**

15. The Commission has found that, where the parties have agreed to a negotiated rate, it is reasonable for the parties to include a provision that the shipper not seek, under NGA section 5, to change the agreed-upon rate for the service to be provided under the negotiated rate. This assures that there will be rate certainty for the duration of the agreement and that both parties will receive the benefits of their bargain. The Commission has also observed that, in the negotiated rate situation, the shipper has the option of obtaining service at the just and reasonable recourse rate, without having to give up its section 5 rights.

---

<sup>5</sup> *Gulf South*, 115 FERC ¶ 61,123 at P 6.

16. However, the Commission finds Gulf South's proposed section 5 waiver provision to be overly broad, because it is not limited to the particular negotiated rate transaction in question, and thus may limit shippers' statutory rights in an unduly discriminatory manner. Under the section 5 waiver provision in the *pro forma* negotiated rate letter agreements at issue here, as interpreted by Gulf South in its answer, the shipper would waive its right to challenge the pipeline's maximum rates applicable to the rate schedule under which the shipper has contracted for transportation service. Thus, under Gulf South's proposal, it appears that a shipper with a negotiated FTS or NNS rate agreement would be prohibited from exercising its section 5 statutory rights to seek a reduction in Gulf South's FTS or NNS maximum tariff rates, even if the shipper also has maximum or discounted rate agreements under the same rate schedules.

17. Moreover, Gulf South's proposed section 5 waiver provision would prohibit a negotiated rate shipper from participating in any section 5 proceedings regarding Gulf South's tariff fuel rate because there is only one system-wide fuel rate on Gulf South and, as such, that rate applies to all services on Gulf South. Thus, under Gulf South's proposal, because of the section 5 waiver provision in a negotiated rate contract for one service, the shipper would not be able to seek a reduction under section 5 in Gulf South's fuel rates with respect to services under other service agreements the shipper may have with Gulf South.

18. In *Columbia*,<sup>6</sup> the Commission stated that "the Commission has been reluctant to sanction a Section 5 waiver in a service agreement for a particular transaction, where the customer waives its Section 5 rights not only as to the rate for its particular transaction at issue, but as to the pipeline's rates for all services." The United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit recently affirmed the Commission's decision in *Columbia*.<sup>7</sup> The court accepted the Commission's explanation that it has a general policy of restricting the use of section 5 waiver clauses to relatively narrow situations involving individual transactions, which do not involve market power, discrimination issues, or significantly insulate the pipeline's rate structure from challenges.

19. Gulf South claims that the Commission previously approved certain individual negotiated rate agreements that contained the same section 5 waiver provision at issue here.<sup>8</sup> However, in that case, the negotiated rate agreements included a provision for the negotiated rate to be adjusted if Gulf South earns a return above a certain level as calculated pursuant to a formula, and the section 5 waiver provision stated that the waiver

---

<sup>6</sup> *Columbia*, 111 FERC ¶ 61,338 at P 14.

<sup>7</sup> *Columbia Gas Transmission Corp. v. FERC*, No. 05-1285 (D.C. Cir. 2007).

<sup>8</sup> *Gulf South*, 115 FERC ¶ 61,123.

was “in consideration for the revenue sharing mechanism described above.” The Commission found that, in that circumstance, the section 5 waiver provision was permissible, because a section 5 action brought by the shipper could affect the level of the negotiated rate for the particular transaction in question due to the revenue sharing mechanism. By contrast, the section 5 waiver provision which Gulf South proposes to include in its *pro forma* negotiated rate letter agreement would apply, regardless of whether the negotiated rate included any provision that would cause the negotiated rate to be affected by the level of the maximum tariff rate for the service. Moreover, the Commission has recently held that, even where a negotiated rate agreement does contain such a provision, the shipper should nevertheless be permitted to challenge the relevant maximum rate, with the only limit being that the results of the section 5 proceeding would not affect the particular negotiated rate at issue.<sup>9</sup>

20. For the reasons stated above, the Commission holds that Gulf South must either: (1) remove the limitations on section 5 rights from the *pro forma* negotiated rate letter agreements at issue here, (2) refile those agreements to adopt the language suggested by Indicated Shippers in their response, or (3) refile those agreements to include new language that restricts only the shipper’s right to seek a reduction in the negotiated rate applicable to the particular transaction at issue, and does not prevent the shipper from exercising its section 5 rights with respect to other services or to Gulf South’s maximum tariff rates.

21. In addition, in light of the fact that Gulf South proposes that the customer is to have an option such that it “may agree” to the section 5 waiver provision, simply bracketing the section 5 waiver provision in the *pro forma* negotiated rate letter agreements does not ensure that the customer specifically has agreed to include that waiver provision in its negotiated rate letter agreement. Within 20 days of the date this order issues, Gulf South must file revised *pro forma* negotiated rate letter agreements with language that clearly states that the section 5 waiver provision applies only to shippers that agree to the language as part of their negotiated rate letter agreement.

### **Contract Flexibility and Conformity**

#### **Comments**

22. Merrill Lynch requests that Gulf South clarify that the language in its *pro forma* negotiated rate letter agreements is consistent with, and provides no additional flexibility as compared to, the currently-effective *pro forma* letter agreements regarding primary points, additional primary points, and contract MDQ. Merrill Lynch asserts that because the language governing primary points in the two sets of *pro forma* letter agreements is

---

<sup>9</sup> *USGen New England, Inc.*, 118 FERC ¶ 61,172, at P 23 (2007).

different, Merrill Lynch is concerned that the *pro forma* negotiated rate letter agreements include additional rights and flexibility regarding a negotiated rate shipper's primary points, which could result in negotiated rate shippers having additional rights and flexibility over recourse rate or discount rate shippers.

23. Merrill Lynch states that another significant difference between the *pro forma* negotiated rate letter agreements and the currently-effective *pro forma* letter agreement is that the *pro forma* negotiated rate letter agreements include an additional Exhibit for "Additional Eligible Primary Point Pair(s)."

### **Answers**

24. In Gulf South's answer, Gulf South states that the language differences were not intended to reflect additional flexibility for negotiated rate shippers, regarding capacity rights, which are not available to discounted or maximum rate shippers. Thus, Gulf South agrees to substitute the language from its existing *pro forma* FTS discounted rate letter agreement in the proposed *pro forma* negotiated rate letter agreement. In addition, Gulf South will conform the exhibits to its negotiated rate letter agreement to those for the existing FTS discounted rate agreement.

25. In Merrill Lynch's response to Gulf South's answer, Merrill Lynch states that if Gulf South conforms the proposed *pro forma* negotiated rate letter agreements to the existing *pro forma* FTS discounted rate letter agreement and exhibits as proposed in Gulf South's answer, these changes should address the concerns raised by Merrill Lynch in its comments.

### **Commission Ruling**

26. The Commission agrees that Gulf South should conform the language in the proposed *pro forma* negotiated rate letter agreements to the language in the currently effective *pro forma* firm transportation service letter agreement. Therefore, Gulf South must file revised tariff sheets implementing the agreed to changes within 20 days of the date this order issues.

27. Furthermore, Gulf South's *pro forma* negotiated rate letter agreements include the following provision that we will reject, for reasons as discussed below:

In the event the language of this Agreement conflicts with the Contract, the language of this Agreement will control.

28. *Pro forma* letter agreements should be the starting point when crafting a negotiated rate agreement. To the extent provisions in the negotiated agreement are intended to be different from the corresponding provisions contained in the *pro forma* negotiated rate letter agreement, such provisions must be placed in the appropriate section of the letter agreement with the changes highlighted with redline and strikeout. In

other words, the provisions of the negotiated rate agreement should be identical to the provisions contained in the *pro forma* negotiated rate letter agreement unless the pipeline intends to modify the rights and obligations of the parties as contained in the *pro forma* negotiated rate letter agreements. If such modification is the intent of the parties, the negotiated service agreement must reflect, in redline and strikeout, these differences from the *pro forma* negotiated rate letter agreement and file the agreements for Commission review.<sup>10</sup> Further, such action will obviate any need for pipelines to request language which would permit a letter agreement to control if a conflict develops concerning the rights and obligations of the parties under the letter agreement as opposed to the contract. Therefore, this provision is not acceptable, and Gulf South must file to remove the provision within 20 days of the date this order issues.

### **Evergreen Provision**

#### **Comments**

29. Entex and Atmos argue that Gulf South has not adequately supported the proposed evergreen provision or explained why existing tariff provisions do not satisfy the market's requests for increased rate certainty. Furthermore, Entex and Atmos assert that Gulf South does not provide any concrete examples of circumstances where any new or existing customers were unable to secure adequate capacity at negotiated rates for an extended term along with a contractual right of first refusal.

30. Entex and Atmos are concerned that Gulf South's proposed evergreen proposal may have a negative impact on both existing and new customers and may frustrate the competitive goals adopted by the Commission in Order No. 636. In addition, Entex and Atmos state, Gulf South's proposal may result in capacity being tied up for significant periods of time with no opportunity for existing or new customers, who may value the capacity more than the existing customer, to either bid on [or] obtain the capacity at its contract expiration date. Since Gulf South already permits customers to negotiate a contractual ROFR so that they may retain capacity upon the expiration of their contracts, Entex and Atmos assert that Gulf South's current proposal for evergreen rights is unnecessary. Moreover, contrary to Gulf South's assertion, Entex and Atmos assert that the ROFR process does provide rate certainty, so an evergreen option is not needed and should be rejected.

---

<sup>10</sup> See *Natural Gas Pipeline Negotiated Rate Policies and Practices*, 104 FERC ¶ 61,134 (2003).

### **Commission Ruling**

31. Gulf South is proposing to allow Gulf South and its customers to agree to include an evergreen right provision in an NNS or FTS discounted rate or letter agreement or NNS or FTS negotiated rate letter agreement. Gulf South's tariff does not currently provide for such an option.

32. Gulf South asserts that the proposed evergreen provision provides shippers the opportunity to lock in a rate for future capacity. Gulf South states that Gulf South and a customer could agree to the rate that would apply at the end of the contract term. Gulf South states that once the capacity is initially awarded, through the posting and bidding process established in section 7.4 of Gulf South's GT&C, that rate could be established if that is the option agreed to by the customer and Gulf South. At the end of the initial contract period, Gulf South states, if the customer desires to exercise its right under the evergreen provision, the contract would be extended at the same rate and MDQ, and at a term selected by the customer, so long as such term does not exceed that of the initial contract. Gulf South continues that if the customer elects not to exercise its evergreen right, then the capacity would be remarketed and subject to the posting and bidding requirements of the tariff.

33. The Commission finds Gulf South's proposed evergreen right provision in its NNS and FTS discounted rate and negotiated rate letter agreements, does not pose a risk of undue discrimination or negative impact upon other shippers, and does not affect the quality of service that Gulf South provides. When the Commission restricted the regulatory ROFR to long-term maximum rate shippers in Order No. 637, the Commission held that pipelines could offer either a contractual ROFR or an evergreen clause to non-maximum rate shippers who did not qualify for the regulatory ROFR.<sup>11</sup> However, if a pipeline includes evergreen provisions in its agreements, it must do so on a nondiscriminatory basis.<sup>12</sup>

34. In *TransColorado*, the Commission found that pipelines are permitted to rollover existing contracts at maximum or discounted rates without offering the subject capacity

---

<sup>11</sup> *Regulation of Short-Term Natural Gas Transportation Services and Regulation of Interstate Natural Gas Transportation Services*, Order No. 637, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,091 at 31,340, *clarified*, Order No. 637-A, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,099, *reh'g denied*, Order No. 637-B, 92 FERC ¶ 61,062 (2000), *aff'd in part and remanded in part sub nom. Interstate Natural Gas Ass'n of America v. FERC*, 285 F.3d 18 (D.C. Cir. 2002), *order on remand*, 101 FERC ¶ 61,127, *order on reh'g*, 106 FERC ¶ 61,088, *aff'd sub nom. American Gas Ass'n v. FERC*, 428 F.3d 255 (D.C. Cir. 2005).

<sup>12</sup> Order No. 636-A, at pp. 30,627-28.

to other shippers.<sup>13</sup> In *Northern Natural*, the Commission explained that the pipeline and the shipper could extend the term of capacity without following posting procedures for the capacity whether or not the proceeding involves more than a mere rollover of the capacity.<sup>14</sup> The Commission stated that, while it has articulated a goal of placing capacity in the hands of those who value it most highly, the Commission assumes that the pipeline will always seek the highest possible rate from non-affiliated shippers, since it is in its own economic interest to do so. Accordingly, the Commission has not required pipelines to sell capacity solely through posted open seasons, with bids evaluated on a net present value basis. Therefore, to the extent that Gulf South's proposed evergreen provision allows Gulf South to negotiate agreements under which the shipper may extend the term of a less than maximum rate contract without the participation of third parties, such action is not prohibited by Commission policy. Therefore, the Commission finds that these provisions are permissible and will accept them without condition.

35. For the reasons stated above, the Commission accepts the proposed tariff sheets effective April 1, 2007, subject to Gulf South filing revised tariff sheets reflecting changes to its proposed NNS and FTS *pro forma* negotiated rate letter agreements, as discussed above, within 20 days of the date this order issues.

The Commission orders:

(A) The tariff sheets listed in the Appendix are accepted, subject to the conditions discussed in the body of the instant order, to be effective April 1, 2007.

(B) Within 20 days of the issuance of the instant order, Gulf South must file revised tariff sheets consistent with the discussion in the body of this order.

By the Commission.

( S E A L )

Philis J. Posey,  
Acting Secretary.

---

<sup>13</sup> *TransColorado Gas Transmission Co.*, 109 FERC ¶ 61,117 (2004).

<sup>14</sup> *Northern Natural Gas Co.*, 111 FERC ¶ 61,379, at P 39, *order on reh'g*, 113 FERC ¶ 61,188 (2005).

**Appendix**

**Gulf South Pipeline Company, LP  
FERC Gas Tariff, Sixth Revised Volume No. 1**

***Tariff Sheets Effective April 1, 2007***

Sixth Revised Sheet No. 102  
Third Revised Sheet No. 304  
Third Revised Sheet No. 4100  
Third Revised Sheet No. 4300  
Second Revised Sheet No. 4752  
Second Revised Sheet No. 4757  
Original Sheet No. 4764  
Original Sheet No. 4765  
Original Sheet No. 4766  
Original Sheet No. 4767  
Original Sheet No. 4768  
Original Sheet No. 4769  
Original Sheet No. 4770  
Original Sheet No. 4771  
Original Sheet No. 4772  
Original Sheet No. 4773  
Original Sheet No. 4774  
Original Sheet No. 4775  
Sheet Nos. 4776 - 4799